

REMARKS

Claims 1 and 3 to 17 are pending in the present application after the cancellation herein without prejudice of claim 2. Claims 1, 3, 4 and 15 to 17 have been amended herein without prejudice. No new matter has been added. In view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable and reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Applicants note with appreciation the acknowledgment of the claim for foreign priority and the indication that all copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

Applicants thank the Examiner for considering the previously filed Information Disclosure Statement, PTO-1449 papers and cited references.

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 3, 7 to 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,801,893 (“Backfried et al.”). Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,049,594 (“Furman et al.”). Claims 4 to 6 and 12 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Backfried et al. and Furman et al.

Objection to the Drawings:

The Examiner objected to the Drawings as failing to comply with 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a) because “they fail to show/describe the components as described in the specification.” Office Action, page 2. In Figure 1, a curved line has been reinserted at the upper end of the block representing reference character 2, a vocabulary database. Applicants believe the drawings are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. 1.83(a). Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Objection to the Claims/Specification

On page 3 of the Office Action, under the heading “Claim Objections,” the Examiner objected to “[t]he Specification” because “the term “voice recognition” is misused for what nowadays is called --speech recognition-- in the speech signal processing art.” In the Substitute Specification submitted herewith, Applicants have amended the Specification, without prejudice, as suggested by the Examiner. Applicants have also amended the claims and Abstract to replace the terminology “voice recognition” with the terminology “speech recognition.” Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the objection.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102 and § 103

In the Office Action, claims 1 to 3, 7 to 11 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Backfried et al. Claims 16 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Furman et al. Claims 4 to 6 and 12 to 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the combination of Backfried et al. and Furman et al. As an initial matter, the rejection of claim 2 is moot as claim 2 has been canceled herein without prejudice.

Backfried et al. purport to describe a method and apparatus for adding new words with yet unseen spellings and pronunciations to the vocabulary of a speech system. Column 1, lines 7 to 11. The method described in Backfried et al. involves a determination step for a new word in which a regularity value is determined which measures the conformity of the new word with respect to a pronunciation in a language or language domain. Next, in a comparison step, the regularity value is compared to a threshold value to decide whether the conformity is insufficient. If there is insufficient conformity, a prompting step is performed which prompts the user for additional information on the pronunciation of the new word. And finally, in an extension step, the new word and an acoustic pattern of the new word are added to the vocabulary. *See Abstract and column 3, lines 1 to 12.*

Furman et al. purport to describe a technique for creating, training and using a telecommunication network. Abstract and column 1, line 66 to column 2, line 1. The technique involves the automatic determination by a network element of likely called parties for a given customer based on records of network usage by the customer. Column 2, lines 1 to 4. Names of the likely called parties are purportedly determined through the use of a reverse telephone directory database. Column 2, lines 4 to 6.

Amended independent claim 1 recites “speaking the vocabulary data to the voice recognition system in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.” Amended independent claim 16 recites that “speech data is spoken into the vocabulary database in an automated manner using the audio module so as to expand the vocabulary database.” Support for amended claims 1 and 16 may be found, e.g., in paragraphs [0019], [0021], [0022] and [0023] of the Substitute Specification and originally filed claim 2. It is respectfully submitted that Backfried et al. do not teach or suggest speaking vocabulary/speech data into a vocabulary database in an automated manner using an audio module, as recited in claims 1 and 16. Instead, in Backfried et al., new words are added to the vocabulary of a speech system after prompting a user for additional information regarding the new word. *See, e.g.,* column 3, lines 28 to 32 and column 4, lines 19 to 38. Nowhere do Backfried et al. describe adding words into a vocabulary data base in an automated manner using an audio module. Indeed, column 8, lines 60 to 64 of Backfried et al., the provision of Backfried et al. cited by the Office Action as disclosing the aforementioned feature of claim 1, states that a “user tries to add a new word” *See* Office Action, page 4. In contrast to Backfried et al., the present application provides that “instead of using a person to train a voice recognition system, or using persons to create/expand the vocabulary database, the new words to be learned are spoken to the voice recognition system in an automated manner” Specification, paragraph [0019].

Furman et al. is not relied on for teaching or suggest the feature of speaking vocabulary/speech data into a vocabulary database in an automated manner using an audio module, as recited in claims 1 and 16. Indeed, Furman et al. do not teach or suggest at least this feature.

Because neither Backfried et al. nor Furman et al. teach or suggest at least the above recited features of independent claims 1 and 16, it is respectfully submitted that neither Backfried et al. nor Furman et al., whether taken alone or in combination, render claims 1 and 16, or their respective dependent claims, unpatentable.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the respective rejections to remaining claims 1 and 3 to 17 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and 103 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: August 31, 2007

Respectfully submitted,

By 
Erik R. Swanson

Registration No.: 40,833
DARBY & DARBY P.C.
P.O. Box 770
Church Street Station
New York, New York 10008-0770
(212) 527-7700
(212) 527-7701 (Fax)
Attorneys/Agents For Applicant

Attachments